Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-8 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the independent claim. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Support for the foregoing amendments to independent claim 1 appear, for example, in *page 5, lines 12-18 and page 13, lines 11-36, of the specification as filed.* Support for the foregoing amendments to claims 5-8 appear, for example, in *page 20, lines 17-23 of the specification as filed.*

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Examiner Interview of June 26, 2008

Applicants wish to thank Examiners Raj. J. Rajiv and Rachel Porter for taking the time to conduct a telephonic interview on June 26, 2008 with Applicant's representatives, Anbar Khal and Gaurav Asthana. The rejections presented in the April 10, 2008 Office Action were discussed. During the interview, Applicant's representatives explained the claimed invention and pointed out differences between the invention and the cited references. In particular, Applicant's representatives suggested that the cited references did not teach building a database of standard terms or storing the standard terms through a web screen, as recited in claim 1. The Examiners suggested further defining the claimed language to distinguish over the cited references. The preceding claim

amendments and the following remarks incorporate many of the suggestions presented

by the Examiners and Applicant's representative during the interview to overcome the

rejections. Entry of these amendments and allowance of the present application is

respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, as being indefinite for the languages

"one selection or check item." Claim 1 has been amended to recite "one of a selection

item and a check item." Applicant therefore respectfully requests the rejection be

withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,823,948 to Ross, Jr. et al. ("Ross") in view of U.S.

Patent No. 6,047,259 to Campbell et al. ("Campbell").

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite:

> building, by a service-providing system, a database of standard terms,
> wherein the step of building the database of standard terms includes:
>> selecting a plurality of terms as the standard terms, wherein the
> plurality of terms are at least one of terms regarding cardinal symptoms of
> patients used as a variety of names by doctors or nurses, diagnosis names,
> operation names, terms used upon writing of the status of patients by
> nurses, terms used upon writing of the status of the patients by doctors,
> prescription terms used by the doctors, and medicine terms, and
>> storing the standard terms in the database, wherein the plurality of
> terms selected as the standard terms include terms extracted from terms
> used in existing medical records.
>
> In accordance with amended claim 1, a variety of terms in the medical industry

are built into a database by standard terms. Specifically, as recited in claim 1, terms are

selected as the standard terms include terms extracted from existing medical records. *See, e.g., page 5, lines 12-18 and page 13, lines 11-36, of the specification.* The selected plurality of terms are at least one of terms regarding cardinal symptoms of patients used as a variety of names by doctors or nurses, diagnosis names, operation names, terms used upon writing of the status of patients by nurses, terms used upon writing of the status of the patients by doctors, prescription terms used by the doctors, and medicine terms. *See page 8, lines 35 to page 9, line 12.*

The standard terms are provided through a web screen as a selection item or a check item, or are provided selection items applicable to writing of a statement sentence. These standard terms can then be selected and used by the user. *See, e.g., page 18, line 36 to page 19, line 32 of the specification.* For example, Figure 3a shows a doctor web screen output on the doctor terminal 20 that includes a variety of standard terms (154a-11) capable of representing cardinal symptoms for patients. The doctor can select a cardinal symptom standard term related to a given patient.

As provided by dependent claim 2, the standard terms can be mapped to standard codes, thereby allowing for medical terms to be computerized internationally as well as domestically, permitting medical information to be easily shared. *See Figure 2a of the application and accompanying description at page 16 of the specification.*

As recited in dependent claims 5-8, the service-providing system provides through the web screen at least one of a modify function that permits a manager to modify a standard term in the database, a delete function that permits the manager to delete a standard term from the database, an add function that permits the manager to add a standard term to the database, and a standard statement sentence write function that

permits the manager to combine standard terms into a standard statement sentence that may be later used to write a medical record. Thus, managers can newly register, delete and modify standard terms in the database through the web screen. The manager can also form standard statement sentences in advance, which a nurse may then be able to select to write a nursing diary, for example. *See, e.g., Fig. 4a and accompanying description at page 20, lines 17-23 of the specification.*

In the Office Action (see page 4), it is asserted that the Ross patent discloses every feature of the method of claims 1-8, except for the step of providing standard terms through a web screen, but that the Campbell patent teaches this step.

Applicant respectfully traverses. Ross neither teaches nor suggests the step of *building the database of standard terms*. Ross teaches automatic generation of a medical record, in which all acquired data is collated into a properly formatted medical record. Ross teaches a "prephrased text" module, allowing prephrased text examples stored in file servers to be selected by physicians and nurses for entry into appropriate section of a medical record. *See Figure 3 and page 5, lines 60-65 of the Ross patent.* However, Ross is silent with regard to building a database of such prephrased text. Further, while Ross teaches storing of patient data, such stored data does not include terms "extracted from terms used in existing medical records," as recited in claim 1. Consequently, Ross does not disclose *building* of a database of standard terms, wherein the plurality of terms selected as the standard terms include terms extracted from terms used in existing medical records, as provided in claim 1.

Further, Campbell does not disclose the step of "providing, by the service-providing system, the standard terms through a web screen," as recited in claim 1.

Campbell teaches that computers throughout a hospital are quipped with client software

that provides a graphical user interface comprising a number of screens in a windowing

environment. Campbell does not disclose that the display data on the computers is

through a web screen. *See col. 3, lines 35-64* of Campbell. In addition, Campbell does

not disclose *building* of a database of standard terms, wherein the plurality of terms

selected as the standard terms include terms extracted from terms used in existing

medical records, as provided in claim 1. Therefore, Campbell does not cure the

deficiencies of Ross. For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is patentable over

Ross and Campbell. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the rejection be

withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2 and 5-8

Claims 2 and 5-8 depend from and add features to claim 1; therefore these claims

are patentable for at least the same reasons as described above with respect to claim 1. In

addition, with regard to claims 5-8, neither Ross nor Campbell teach functions for

management of the standard terms in the database and a standard statement sentence

write function. As noted above, Ross describes that prephrased text examples are stored

in file servers. However, Ross is silent with regard management of the prephrased text

examples stored in the file server. Consequently, Ross does not disclose providing

through a web screen at least one of a modify function, a delete function and an add

function for management of the standard terms in the database and a standard statement

sentence write function, as recited in claim 1. Campbell does not cure the deficiencies

of Ross. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Ross and Campbell, and

Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

Atty. Dkt. No. 2443.0030000

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Anbar F. Khal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 59,088

Date: 8-8-08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
828989

Atty. Dkt. No. 2443.0030000